

March 1, 2007

Reference: Application 10/605,516

To:  
Mail Stop Amendment  
Commissioner for Patents  
Art Unit 2877

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT-ELECTION OF SPECIES

Dear Sir,

The requirement for election requirement is hereby traversed on the grounds that the requirement arisen from peculiar wording of original claims, while the species of the invention are not patentably distinct. In fact all original claims describe operation of single feedback loop that controls sophisticated apparatus. And a search of classes and subclasses relevant to species elected below reveals the art relevant to non-elected claims.

It is well known that common feedback loop accounts for sensors and actuators. The group I emphasizes on sensory subcomponent while the groups II-IV on actuator subcomponent. It is important that present invention considers feedback for specific purpose of controlling cantilever type device. Notice that controlling method for plurality of cantilever type devices can not be different from deformation. That is why Group II and III are essentially the same species as process of creation of “**controlled deformations**” is synonym to “**controlling operation**” as cited in non-elected claims. On other hand, it is well known that cantilever “**oscillation**” is one of the modes of “**controlled deformations**” of cantilevers. In public literature such modes are referred as TM (Tapping Mode), FM (Force Modulation), LF (Lateral Force), etc.  
The above presents the grounds that four groups do not represent four distinct invention species but rather different views of single species.

Based on these I appeal to consider this invention without restrictions. In case this petition is declined I elect group I.

Regards,



Igor Touzov  
Tel: (919)342-6162  
Email: igor@touzov.com